DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 886 HE 036 293

AUTHOR	Turlington, Barbara; Collins, Naomi F.; Porcelli, Maura
TITLE	Where Credit Is Due: Approaches to Course and Credit Recognition across Borders in U.S. Higher Education Institutions.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	68p.; "Useful Strategies and Instruments from Select FIPSE-funded Consortial Exchanges with North American and European Countries and Other Programs."
AVAILABLE FROM	ACE Fulfillment Service, Department 191, Washington, DC 20055-0191 (Item no. 309486, $20). Tel: 301-632-6757; Fax: 301-843-0159.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*College Credits; College Students; Credit Courses; Higher Education; *Study Abroad; Transfer Policy; *Transfer Students

ABSTRACT

Based on interviews with project directors and additional research, the American Council on Education has developed this guide to help faculty and administrators address credit recognition for coursework and internships abroad. The guide provides resources and sample methodology and outlines elements that project directors have identified as keys to success. It illustrates processes and credits that have facilitated credit, course, and internship recognition. The elements and instruments detailed in this guide are a compilation of lessons learned by project directors. To supplement descriptions of processes and approaches, the guide also includes products or descriptions of products devised to facilitate smooth understanding. Also includes are three sample sets of steps to follow when approaching articulation issues, checklists to systematize discussion, and a list of useful resources. Thirteen appendixes contain the samples and other examples of practice. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 886

Where CREDIT Is Due:

Approaches to Course and Credit Recognition Across Borders in U.S. Higher Education Institutions

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Bressler
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

HE 028 913

American Council on Education
Center for Institutional and International Initiatives

AMERICA
EPTENTRIONA
LIS.
NOVA
MAR
PACIFI-
MARE

Where CREDIT Is Due:

Approaches to Course and Credit Recognition Across Borders in U.S. Higher Education Institutions

Useful Strategies and Instruments from Select FIPSE-funded Consortial Exchanges with North American and European Countries and Other Programs

A guide developed by the American Council on Education, with support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education, 2001–02

Barbara Turlington, Project Co-Director
Naomi F. Collins, Project Co-Director
Maura Porcelli, Program Associate

American Council on Education
Center for Institutional and International Initiatives

Copyright © 2002

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, DC 20036

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Additional copies of this publication are available by sending a check or money order for $20 per copy, plus $6.95 shipping and handling (for orders of more than one copy, call the number below), to the following address:

ACE Fulfillment Service
Department 191
Washington, DC 20055-0191
Phone: (301) 632-6757
Fax: (301) 843-0159

When ordering, please specify Item #309486.
A free electronic version of this report is available through www.acenet.edu/bookstore.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments iii

Foreword v

Introduction 1

Data, Sources, and Methodology 5

Elements of Success: Approaches and Strategies that Work 7

Implementation Strategies:
Instruments that Effect or Ease Credit and Course Recognition 17

Recording Grades or Credit: Bases for Determining Equivalency or Comparability 27

External Standards and Requirements:
The Role of Professional Accreditation, Certification, and Licensing 29

Looking Ahead 35

Conclusion 37

Appendices 39

- Appendix 1: Sample Meeting Agenda 40
- Appendix 2: Sample Work Plan 41
- Appendix 3: Checklist of Campus Personnel Who Are Key to Successful Credit Recognition 43
- Appendix 4: Sample Memorandum of Understanding 44
- Appendix 5: Sample Memorandum of Agreement 1 45
- Appendix 6: Sample Memorandum of Agreement 2 46
- Appendix 7: The Comprehensive Agreement: Checklist of Topics to Consider in Drafting an MOU 48
- Appendix 8: Sample Program/Modular Equivalency 49
- Appendix 9: Sample Pre-departure Agreement 1 50
- Appendix 10: Sample Pre-departure Agreement 2 51
- Appendix 11: Other Frameworks for Credit Recognition and Quality Assurance 56
- Appendix 12: Study Participants 61
- Appendix 13: Useful Sources and Resources, Print and Electronic 63

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgments

Many people contributed to this publication, *Where Credit Is Due: Approaches to Course and Credit Recognition Across Borders in U.S. Higher Education Institutions.* We are very grateful for the thoughtful participation of our advisory committee members, Carol Bobby (Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors), Carol Fimmen (Western Illinois University), Francisco Marmolejo (Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration), Martha Nichols-Pecceu (Eckerd College), Timothy Thompson (University of Pittsburgh), Jack Van de Water (Oregon State University), and Robert Shoenberg, who served as formative evaluator and consultant.

We would also like to thank those who participated in extensive interviews concerning one or more projects: Marius Cucurny (Orange Coast College), David Doherty (Kettering University), Teresa Donahue (San Diego State University), Willis King (University of Houston), Donna Markle (Oregon Health Sciences University), James Ratcliff (The Pennsylvania State University), and Mark Weisner (Rice University).

A number of people made a difference by participating in special meetings or provided responses to complex inquiries, including Miriam Assefa (World Education Services, Inc.), Milton Blood (International Association for Management Education), Paul Bonde (ECTS Consultant), the late Barbara Burn (University of Massachusetts-Amherst), Peggy Blumenthal (Institute of International Education), Alice Chandler (State University of New York at New Paltz), John Grandin (University of Rhode Island), Mary Anne Grant (International Student Exchange Program), Janet Headley (Georgia State University), John Klus (University of Wisconsin), Barbara Lauren (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers), Axel Markert (Eberhard-Karls-Universitat Tuebingen), William Nolting (University of Michigan), Marianne Phelps (U.S. Department of Education, ret.), Ishwar Puri (University of Illinois at Chicago), Valerie Woolston (University of Maryland), and Michael Yots (University of West Florida).

Finally, we are grateful to the staff of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) for providing support and access to documents, especially Sylvia Crowder, Frank Frankfort, Michael Nugent, and Donald Fischer.

Foreword

A striking dichotomy exists between student interest in studying abroad and student participation in study-abroad programs. Nearly half of incoming college and university students express a desire to study overseas, but fewer than 3 percent actually do. Focus groups conducted by the American Council on Education revealed that students have valid concerns about whether they will receive academic credit for their international coursework upon return to their home campuses. Reported incidents of confusion and conflicts over credit recognition issues with various campus departments discourage students from studying abroad. Students fear that a semester or year's worth of study will not be recognized by their home institution, thus extending their time to degree. And protracted attendance is an issue not only of time, but also of money.

With this in mind, the American Council on Education (ACE), through a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) of the U.S. Department of Education, undertook a study to explore credit recognition as a barrier to study abroad, as well as how specific institutions overcome it. ACE researchers examined case studies from FIPSE-funded projects of the Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education and the European Community-United States of America Cooperation Program in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training. A range of institutional types and disciplines were selected. Extensive interviews were conducted with the project directors to determine the obstacles they faced regarding credit recognition and how they resolved those issues.

Based on interview responses and additional research, ACE has developed this guide to help faculty and administrators address credit recognition for coursework and internships abroad. The guide provides resources and sample methodology and outlines elements that project directors identified as keys to success. It is our hope that as institutions are better equipped to understand successful strategies for international collaboration, barriers to credit recognition will be lifted and the number of students who study abroad will increase.

Introduction

Since the September 11 attacks struck at the core of American life and institutions, it has become increasingly difficult to imagine the United States as exempt from the impact of international events or to believe that U.S. higher education can unbundle a global perspective from the center of academic content and activity. Yet myriad boundaries persist that dissuade students from participating in one of the most beneficial experiences available to them: study abroad.

Despite high levels of interest in international education among incoming college students, an alarmingly small number of students actually engages in study-abroad opportunities. ACE research (2001) indicates that 88 percent of students believe international education gives them a competitive edge in the workforce; 83 percent of college-age respondents believe that international education opportunities are an important consideration when selecting a college or university; and 48 percent of college-bound high school students plan to participate in study-abroad programs. Although interest appears high, participation is low; less than 3 percent of undergraduate students study abroad. Many students never achieve their study-abroad intentions for several reasons: concerns about cost, distraction from career and academic goals, and insufficient time to complete majors. Focus group studies also uncovered that students have valid concerns about credit recognition of coursework and internships completed abroad.

Indeed, faculty and staff may view international programs as extra or marginal rather than integral and central to the university mission. Administrators may grapple with providing academic recognition for international study and internships. Whatever the reason, students and parents often view full credit recognition for international study and internships as a major, sometimes insurmountable, barrier to higher education interchange. Difficulty with credit recognition can discourage students from participating in international programs or unduly increase the time required to obtain their degrees. Students sometimes encounter obstacles when they choose to participate in study-abroad programs not sponsored by their home institution or when they

change their course selection once they arrive at their host university. Two scenarios present frequent problems: (1) students and faculty do not reach an understanding about the award of credit prior to the students' departure, and (2) approved courses are no longer available once students arrive at the host institution, and these students must take classes for which they will not receive credit. When faculty at home institutions are skeptical, questioning the quality and content of the study-abroad curricula, they hesitate to award credit—to do so would compromise the value of the degree from the home institution.

The structure and role of study-abroad programs in the context of institutional administration vary from school to school; as a result, there is no commonly accepted methodology for credit recognition that can apply to all colleges and universities. In an effort to create a resource that might help institutions address this inconsistency, the American Council on Education (ACE) conducted a study to determine how participants in exchange programs funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) addressed credit recognition. ACE researchers selected projects from the Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education and the European Community–United States of America Cooperation Program in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training (US/EC). Each of the projects that ACE examined included a minimum of six institutions, with at least two schools in three countries. In order to devise a set of best practices, the principal investigators interviewed select project directors and other professionals, participated in specialized meetings, and researched project documents and case studies.

Despite the perception that credit recognition presents a significant barrier to international exchange opportunities, many institutions have devised successful strategies and mechanisms to ease the portability of credit for international studies and internships. This guide illustrates processes and products that facilitate credit, course, and internship recognition. It is designed to help institutions think systematically about their administrative processes in order to ease the portability of credit earned by students abroad. The guide targets novice and experienced administrators (deans and others) and faculty (in professional schools and liberal arts) embarking, or considering embarking, on FIPSE-supported or similar types of programs. Sections of the guide may prove useful to others, including federal and private agencies that seek to develop interinstitutional collaborations that improve student mobility and credit recognition. Successful outcomes can advance campus internationalization, enhance institutional offerings, and attract new students; strengthen the depth and breadth of faculty curricular and research collaboration; and ensure recognition for international studies and internships.

The guide also addresses the inherent paradox that exists in seeking equivalency between home and host country courses. Namely, one significant reason to study or apprentice abroad is to gain perspective on the professional or academic field itself by learning what is culturally different, not the same, about the study, teaching, and practice of a particular profession or discipline abroad versus that at home. In fact, most programs that ACE studied were designed with a dual purpose:

- To strengthen professional competence by better understanding how individuals in another country practice a particular profession (for example, to experience business in Mexico, acquire a global perspective on environmental management, develop comparative understanding of higher education, or be able to practice computer science globally).
- To strengthen language skills and cultural understanding.

It is important to recognize that the negotiation process among multilateral partners is itself infused with cultural differences–sometimes unrecognized–in assumptions, approaches, and uses of terminology that shape the formation and implementation of agreements and programs.

This guide illustrates those *processes* and *approaches* that facilitated credit, course, and internship recognition. The elements and instruments detailed in this guide are a compilation of lessons learned by project directors, with examples of strategies they used or suggest using to effect optimal results. The apparent simplicity of some of these factors and strategies, evident after the fact, belies the time and effort invested to learn these lessons. In noting factors responsible for missteps, ACE reports examples confidentially, without highlighting specific projects. By promising to maintain this anonymity, ACE researchers were able to obtain the most candid, complete, and useful information from research, meetings, interviews, and discussions.

To supplement descriptions of processes and approaches employed by project leaders, this guide also includes *products* or *descriptions of products* devised to facilitate smooth understandings: instruments or mechanisms that provide examples of agreements, frameworks, and formats for effecting or easing credit recognition, and for formalizing and institutionalizing the international study and internship experience. These instruments include, for example, memoranda of understanding (MOU), pre-departure agreements, and prototypical tables of course comparability. The guide also provides program directors with three sample sets of steps to follow when approaching articulation issues, checklists to systematize discussion, and a list of useful resources.

Data, Sources, and Methodology

ACE limited the research behind this guide to defined purposes, questions, and parameters surrounding credit recognition issues for U.S. institutions actually participating in the aforementioned projects. ACE did not design this guide to be a quantitative, statistical study or program evaluation. Thus, researchers selected the samples, based on preset criteria and plotted on a matrix, to provide balanced, diverse, and illustrative examples of approaches to credit recognition, rather than representative, statistical samples. Researchers also selected programs to provide a mix of graduate and undergraduate experience: public and private institutions, two- and four-year colleges and universities, as well as programs within both the European Community and North America.

ACE researchers conducted formal interview protocols and reviewed project reports for select programs. They also read North American and European Community–United States of America Cooperation Program in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training program evaluations as well as general articles on credit recognition and quality assurance, and consulted additional program personnel and experts on specific questions. An advisory committee and other professionals participated in two face-to-face meetings at the formative and draft review stages of the project, and an independent evaluator worked on the project from conception to conclusion. The appendices provide the names of advisory committee members, additional participants, other experts consulted, programs selected for the core matrix, and additional programs mentioned or consulted in the guide. For further information about the projects detailed here, the FIPSE web site has posted project profiles. Appendix 12 lists the institutions and the FIPSE project numbers to be used when searching on the web site.

Institutions and experts who worked on this project covered 11 programs at nine institutions in the core matrix, supplemented by discussions with more than 25 additional program representatives and individual experts. The advisory panel and meeting participants included 23 professionals. Programs in the select matrix alone, targeted for in-depth interviews, incorporated the experiences of 200 to 300 undergraduate and graduate students. Other experts and program leaders shared the experiences of additional students.

Elements of Success: Approaches and Strategies that Work

It is not surprising, given institutional autonomy and diversity, that there is no universal fix or one-size-fits-all solution to provide seamless portability of credit. However, ACE researchers learned that credit recognition clearly is not an insurmountable barrier: Institutions have devised a variety of frameworks for easing the portability of credit earned abroad. These frameworks, which ACE identifies and illustrates throughout this guide, help institutions think systematically about their administrative processes and reflect institutions' commitment to their students and the value of students' international experience.

Researchers had hoped to find straightforward approaches to credit recognition. What they found instead was that most lessons learned focused not on narrow credit recognition formulae, but rather on the context or framework in which successful credit recognition can occur.

Project directors identified 10 key elements and strategies for achieving best outcomes for institutions and their students. Although some of these successful elements may appear self-evident, most emerged only after institutions had expended considerable time and effort in grappling with problems that could have been avoided.

ELEMENT 1: Trust. The most important factor in achieving overall program success, and in developing successful credit portability, is establishing strong professional trust among all partners—faculty colleagues and program administrators representing all institutions in each consortium.

Useful Strategy: Partners need to create and cement a professional bond at the outset of the program. Each partnership should begin with an extensive face-to-face meeting and discussion among all partners. The discussion should adhere to a shared detailed agenda developed and distributed prior to the meeting (see Appendix 1 for a sample meeting agenda). All partners should explicitly agree to, and state in advance, the desired outcomes of the meeting. This meeting will ideally set the stage for developing formal agreements, understandings, and documents to guide the project. As one project director stated, "Formal agreements derive from the bonds of professional trust, rather than the other way around."

Partners need to create and cement a professional bond at the outset of the program. Each partnership should begin with an extensive face-to-face meeting and discussion among all partners.

Faculty travel is essential for conducting onsite observation, building substance, and developing professional trust. Visiting facilities (such as laboratories, classrooms, and libraries) on partner campuses and reviewing other institutions' course/program content and context for teaching, learning, research, and/or internships, allows partner institutions to develop confidence in the offerings of respective institutions.

Developing trust also requires understanding one another's grading system, credits, use of specific language, and educational context. Therefore, partners should use face-to-face meetings as opportunities to ask questions and obtain clarification about the meaning of terms and concepts.

In seeking to build trust, participants also need to know the cultural and historical differences among countries, differences that shape institutional and individual thinking and practice.

ELEMENT 2: Communication. Frequent, regular communication among partners is essential to ensuring the smooth functioning of each program, containing potential problems before escalation occurs, and keeping the process on track. Certain project directors relied on weekly, or even daily, contact via telephone, e-mail, or listservs. Other project directors reported quarterly contact. The frequency of contact, the bonds established through regular communication, and the case-by-case approach to students' studies not only enhanced project success but also eased credit and course recognition in the projects that ACE examined.

Useful Strategy: Prior to the onset of the partnership, establish understanding in advance of the mode and frequency of communication, and the comfort level of all partners with various modes (telephone, e-mail, listservs). Then maintain frequent, regular communication among partners to avoid problems with students' course of study or internships before these issues become divisive or destructive. Ideally, project participants will use FIPSE-sponsored meetings, provide for one additional meeting per year, and expect all partners to participate in both of these annual events.

Directors involved in the *Where Credit Is Due* project expressed the following (paraphrased) views on the importance of frequent, regular communication:

- The more frequent the communication, the better. It allows for professional trust to develop. The partners engage in almost weekly communication via e-mail and telephone.
- Communication is critical to this project, as we are dealing with two different types of institutional structures.

- The best form of communication for us was an initial personal meeting among all six partner universities. Without this initial meeting, all the important large and small details that shaped the program would have been very difficult.
- It is important to have an early face-to-face meeting. It was critical in dealing with issues. Faculty continued to build trust through quarterly phone calls.
- Planning meetings are essential. We held formal spring and fall face-to-face meetings. Communication was then done by e-mail and telephone as needed, but was not as frequent as it might have been because the students were engaged at the graduate level, and therefore required less monitoring.
- An initial meeting to build trust is essential to success. Communication should be frequent.
- Two to three days of face-to-face meetings are needed at the beginning of the project. E-mail communication via listservs is vital; faculty use this method to keep one another informed of changes in course catalogues and curriculum. There is also a web site for each program.

ELEMENT 3: Internal Coordination. Develop buy-in at the beginning of the program by engaging all those at the institution who may help play a role in successful outcomes. The number of campus professionals who need to participate in international exchange agreements varies from institution to institution. However, at many colleges and universities, especially large ones, a considerable number of individuals ultimately must be involved in developing and implementing each program. Establishing successful buy-in also can advance internal support, build trust, ensure program sustainability, and allow for institutional transformation.

Develop buy-in at the beginning of the program by engaging all those at the institution who may help play a role in successful outcomes.

Useful Strategy: Identify all individuals on campus who are necessary for successful program implementation, and establish and maintain continuing communications among these professionals. Involve key people and continually update them to ensure the success of the initial face-to-face meeting and the sign-on to formal agreements. Another important, yet sometimes overlooked, step involves notifying the central administration of each participating institution about the program.

Similarly, each partner should ascertain, early in the program development, that the other partners know of the mechanisms for getting things done at their own institutions. Each partner should know how long it takes to get documents developed and approved, what steps need to be taken, and who needs to be involved on

his/her own campus. However, the number and range of individuals involved on each campus will vary from campus to campus, and is not formulaic. For example, the registrar may or may not play a role. But while no universal checklist of campus participants exists, and some institutions have formal guidelines for specific inclusion, each successful program administrator must somehow navigate the institutional structure and personnel to emerge with buy-in or sign-on from the right people (see Appendix 3 for a sample checklist of campus personnel to consider for inclusion).

Partner institutions cited the following examples of internal communication and buy-in:

- One major state university included the following individuals in the agreements for a graduate program: dean of graduate studies; associate dean for graduate studies (who acted in the role of registrar for credit recognition); project director (who also served as advisor to assess oversees experience); department chair for academic programs; and student services international division professional.
- But in the same consortium, a U.S. partner institution–which was a large, private university, decentralized in its decision making–did not require buy-in from any upper-level officials.
- Another state institution reported that participants in the first organizing meeting consisted of some 13 people from three countries and included a mix of faculty, deans, and program administrators.
- At one four-year college, the dean of faculty signed on, while at another, the registrar alone signed on, and that institution did not closely involve any deans.
- Faculty and administrators quickly resolved one difficult situation surrounding credit recognition because of pre-established successful communication among internal institutional players. A registrar on a U.S. campus was reluctant to award the full 12 credits that a student earned for studying in Canada because this number exceeded the maximum of nine allowable transfer credits for a master of arts degree. However, the international education department persuaded the registrar that the student was indeed a full-time student at his or her home institution, arguing that the student was not *transferring* credit per se, but rather requesting that the home institution *recognize* study-abroad credits. Underlying this negotiation, the internal players saw the value of establishing solid relationships and strong communication among themselves.

ELEMENT 4: Agreements Among Institutions. Written agreements among all institutions involved in the program provide greater precision about all areas of exchange than do oral understandings. Written agreements help avoid future potential misunderstandings and delays by setting project expectations well in advance of implementation. They also aid in institutionalizing and sustaining programs beyond the tenures of current program leaders and protect students from uncertainty if a participating faculty member leaves.

The value of these agreements was emphasized by some project directors who had not established such agreements, as well as by many who had. One project director noted that his institution routinely required such agreements in any case.

Useful Strategy: Develop and employ written agreements, including explicit approaches to course and credit recognition and other aspects of the program, before proceeding. Existing institutional documents may or may not suffice. The goal is to create shared understanding among all partners about the specific terms, scope, content, assigned responsibilities, and timetable for the program, leading to formal sign-on by all. Documents also should cover legal and financial implications, obligations, responsible authorities, and means of addressing differences. No one believed that negotiating such written agreements is quick or easy.

Project directors expressed the following comments about the importance of institutional agreements:

- A written agreement is crucial, particularly for institutional administration. Participants should identify guidelines well in advance to avoid future challenges.
- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) should be required from the beginning.

Most consortia developed a single document signed by all members; some used a series of bilateral agreements. Many used existing institutional models for their broad agreements. But when drafting agreements on credit recognition and other issues specific to this program, all partners had a voice in negotiating details.

Different types and numbers of agreements to suit individual institutional needs include:

- Dual-level agreements, both general (institutional) and specific (by project; for example, Clemson University).
- A single, explicit document (for example, Oregon Health Sciences University).
- An explicit document supplemented by another document to promote faculty agreement and development, but not focused on credit recognition (for example, Eckerd College).

Written agreements help avoid future potential misunderstandings and delays by setting project expectations well in advance of implementation.

- An agreement specific to community colleges dictated by state requirements (for example, Orange Coast College).
- Multiple articulation agreements (for example, Kettering University).

ELEMENT 5: Continuity. The loss of a key project leader or participant through unexpected career change, illness, or death or the inadvertent inclusion of an uncommitted individual (or institution) among partners can seriously harm a project. Such losses or inclusions may hinder the progress, morale, and success of a program, and interfere with portability of credit based on professional understandings.

Useful Strategy: At the program outset and before the need arises, program directors should designate backup project leaders and faculty in case of the loss of key personnel.

Program participants should develop strategies to engage as many faculty members as possible in these partnerships, not only to provide backup or replacement in case they lose a key person but also to develop an institutional culture that supports exchange at the departmental level. Program success and sustainability, and student involvement, require a critical mass of faculty committed to a culture of internationalization on campus.

Partner institutions also should keep all written agreements and decisions about individual students' course credits on file for future program directors; such files protect students from possible loss of academic recognition.

If an entire institution discontinues participation, the remaining parties and the funding agency will need to be flexible to keep the program on course.

Project directors at participating institutions shared the following examples of situations affecting continuity:

- In one consortium, a key faculty member at one partner institution was not sufficiently involved, and fellow participants asked the dean of that institution to replace that individual for the sake of the project.
- In another consortium, a key faculty member transferred to another institution and left a gap that other faculty members were not as keen to fill.

ELEMENT 6: Equal Engagement. The ideal consortium requires equal commitment of time, effort, and involvement by all partner institutions, even if it is not easy to attain. Without the sense that each partner institution is equally engaged, a program may encounter difficulties in a number of areas, including agreement on course and credit recognition. The more institutions that are involved, the more difficult equal engagement may become.

Useful Strategy: Secure engagement of all partner institutions at the outset by including all relevant faculty and administrators from participating institutions in all discussions and face-to-face meetings, and in the development and signing of all formal agreements. Avoid hastily choosing partners, and reconsider partners early if one institution's commitment level appears too limited. As appropriate, build on existing relationships. If the program has inadvertently included an uncommitted individual, address the issue expeditiously by changing personnel before problems escalate and progress slows.

Project directors at participating institutions shared several examples of equal engagement. In a small number of cases, the lead institution was disappointed in the lack of involvement, commitment, or communication by one of its U.S. partners. Directors believe that strategies such as those listed here might have prevented the mismatch or imbalance among partners.

ELEMENT 7: Sharing Lessons. Project directors noted that annual meetings of North American or European project directors served as helpful resources in which they could exchange ideas and share experiences.

Useful Strategy: Schedule time to attend meetings of program directors and other networks of appropriate professional associations (such as the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration [CONAHEC], NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and professional and academic associations that draw discipline-based colleagues). These occasions enable participants to share successful strategies, connect with existing partners, and meet new potential partners.

Devise ways to use the Internet to share lessons learned, information about courses and systems, actual courses accepted for credit, grading scales, and other material that will limit time spent reinventing the wheel (for example, see the section on the Global E^3 data bank, in Instrument 4 under "Implementation Strategies" on page 18).

Without the sense that each partner institution is equally engaged, a program may encounter difficulties in a number of areas.

ELEMENT 8: Planning. Even the most effective planner often underestimates the time it takes to develop and implement programs. During the planning process, partners must take several necessary steps toward implementation:

- Come to know and trust one another.
- Familiarize themselves with one another's institutions and courses.
- Develop agreements covering credit and course recognition.
- Establish new courses, or develop tables or charts describing comparable or equivalent courses.
- Recruit and prepare students.
- Develop and disseminate publicity materials.

Most project directors found that three years was insufficient for project planning and implementation. Many agreed that four or five years would better allow full realization of project potential.

Useful Strategy: Recognize from the outset the size of the undertaking and attempt to craft a sequenced work plan with deadlines and assigned responsibilities. A written plan and checklist can help ensure smoother processes, timelier operations, and a shared timetable throughout; may signal greater likelihood of program harmony and sustainability; and can limit misunderstandings.

Avoid or anticipate problems for the student by ensuring that partner institutions agree on credit-related issues before the student leaves and identify resolutions to contingencies (such as course cancellations or substitutions, or safety evacuation).

Clarify in advance with partners and within one's institution financial issues and implications surrounding credits, courses, fees, insurance, and waivers.

During planning, include the opportunity to learn what different countries' grade and credit systems mean, clarify terms, understand educational systems, and create a common language.

At this stage, discuss and build in methods of program evaluation. Recognize that formative evaluation can serve not only as a strategy for success, but also as a tool for program management. Student evaluation can also be incorporated as an after-the-fact assessment, as well as an ongoing contribution to program success (see sample work plan in Appendix 2.)

Project directors at participating institutions shared the following planning-related examples:

- One director of a successful project suggested thinking about projects in five-year blocks, allowing adequate time to see real development.
- Another director noted that it had taken seven to eight years of work to get particular faculty members on board in a meaningful way. This project director also noted that the institution uses the program alumni to stimulate further student participation, thus requiring more time.
- Most directors agreed that the one-year planning timeline was tight, and that once implementation begins, it takes more time than they estimated to recruit and send prepared students abroad. Momentum increases after students return and begin discussing their experiences with other students. Thus, a fourth year becomes necessary, and a fifth year is ideal if the partner institutions want to realize fuller program fruition.

ELEMENT 9: Flexibility. Peripheral and/or unexpected issues can arise that affect the ease of credit recognition. These include:

- Mismatched academic calendars between Europe and the United States.
- Slow reporting of grades from host to home institution (which delays the student's progress).
- Lack of fit between student and course.
- Change in offerings by host institution after pre-departure approval of course.
- Challenges to obtaining language training in less frequently taught languages.
- Loss of a program champion to promote and support the effort.
- Unexpected evacuation without ability to complete work.

Useful Strategy: Plan well in advance for specific contingencies. Then acknowledge that unexpected challenges will arise, although it is impossible to predict exactly the nature, type, and extent of such unanticipated events.

Antidotes that project directors found helpful in facing these contingencies included flexibility on the part of all parties; pre-establishment of good faith and strong relations among colleagues; clear, written agreements and plans; and a good sense of humor.

ELEMENT 10: Support. Because programs are complex and lengthy, they require significant administrative, institutional, partner, financial, and faculty support to develop all aspects of exchange optimally. Directors agree that programs carry a heavy administrative burden and require more time than expected to manage.

Useful Strategies: Before beginning the program, scrutinize existing models, templates, agreements, web sites, lessons learned, and sample materials. Avoid reinventing the wheel.

Attempt to ensure that the home institution provides as much faculty, administrative, and financial support as possible to establish a strong base; engage partners early and regularly through processes of inclusion as well as clear, regular communication. Verify whether existing infrastructures for exchange at branch campuses within a system can lend expertise, experience, or lessons learned. Some project directors were pleasantly surprised to discover resources within other branches of their state system. Directors also learned that a system's central office or branch campus may employ study-abroad specialists who they can tap for valuable knowledge.

Engage as many faculty members as possible to develop an institutional culture that supports exchange at the departmental level. Program success and sustainability, as well as student involvement, require a critical mass of faculty committed to a culture of internationalization on campus.

Implementation Strategies: Instruments that Effect or Ease Credit and Course Recognition

Institutions have devised various instruments to help structure smooth recognition of courses or credits. The prototypes below serve as examples and are not necessarily mutually exclusive or exhaustive. They are designed to illustrate formats that have worked. Where noted, sample instruments appear in the appendices. This section also contains three sample approaches to articulation issues, to help systematize discussion.

INSTRUMENT 1: General Memorandum of Understanding. Some (but not all) institutions develop written MOUs and/or other formal agreements among partners. Of those that do, some develop and sign two documents: a general agreement (often generic to an institution) and an agreement specific to a particular program. Some participants who draft and sign either of these documents use them to address the articulation of courses or programs between institutions. Ideally, the general MOU should include a statement documenting the institution's commitment to credit recognition. (See Appendixes 4 through 7 for a sample generic agreement, examples of existing program agreements, and a checklist of items to consider when developing an MOU.)

INSTRUMENT 2: Articulation Agreement. Several institutions have developed articulation agreements, which are documents that facilitate the recognition of credit. These agreements spell out exactly how the home institution will translate specific host-institution studies to academic credit. One campus model of a domestic articulation agreement is the process by which an institution develops transfer from a community college to a four-year college or university.

INSTRUMENT 3: Individual Formal Course Comparison. Course outlines and descriptions may serve as stand-alone documents for facilitating understanding, or they may help program participants develop further tables or agreements (see Instruments 4 and 5). The template for each course description includes contents, prerequisites, readings, and other requirements and expectations. Such documents can serve at least two purposes: (1) Exchanging outlines at early meetings among partners helps develop transparency of content and thereby serves

Institutions have devised various instruments to help structure smooth recognition of courses or credits.

as the basis for assessment and comparison, and (2) program partners also can use these course descriptions to supplement student transcripts in conveying grades to the home institution. (See also Instrument 9 later in this section. It discusses the European Credit Transfer System, which has developed templates for formalizing this process.)

INSTRUMENT 4: Table of Course Comparability or Equivalency. These documents are designed to align comparable courses at both home and host institutions (for example, course X at Institution A is comparable to course Y at Institution B). This table may be developed through comparison of specific course outlines, contents, and expectations. Note that although specialists in credential evaluation and other expert fields do not consider the terms "comparable" and "equivalent" identical, others appear to use these terms interchangeably in general discussion.

The Global E^3 program of the Institute of International Education (IIE) offers an online example of a table of course comparability. A database matrix–sortable by home and host countries, subfields, and course and equivalency titles–lists overseas courses deemed comparable and creditworthy by individual U.S. institutions. The site also includes grading scales for each institution (see http://www.iie.org).

INSTRUMENT 5: Program and/or Modular Equivalency or Comparability. These charts or tables compare groups of courses within a field or program. While courses at the home and host institutions may not have one-for-one counterparts, a group of two, three, or four courses at Institution A may together cover the scope and content, and fulfill the requirements, of specified courses at Institution B. (San Diego City College uses the term "curriculum mapping" as a first step in developing their comparability matrices.) These instruments also may provide the bases of joint or shared programs, courses, or curricula, as seen in the instruments below (see example in Appendix 8).

INSTRUMENT 6: Review and Approval in Advance of a Menu of Courses. Unlike pre-departure approval of a course or group of courses that a single student intends to pursue abroad, pre-assessment and pre-approval of a number of courses–in some cases constituting an entire program–preclude student-by-student, course-by-course review. First, individual faculty members review a number of different courses by looking at their course descriptions, content, reading, syllabi, teaching or research approaches, requirements, and so forth. If they find these items satisfactory, then they pre-approve the courses, deeming them acceptable for student enrollment and ensuring that the courses will receive proper credit recognition upon the student's successful

completion and return from study abroad. Partners may use these to develop a series of articulation agreements.

INSTRUMENT 7: Crafting a Shared or Joint Course, Program, or Curriculum. A number of U.S. institutions are working together to create one or more joint courses or a joint curriculum with an overseas partner. Curriculum development by project directors is complicated and time-consuming and can exceed the duration allotted for a FIPSE-funded program.

One example of a jointly developed course is the "bridge course" developed by Eckerd College and its partners. The purpose of this three-week bridge course is to provide intensive language and cultural preparation for students in the natural sciences.

In another example, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and its partners abandoned their efforts to provide a common table for course comparison, and chose instead to develop a systematic process for thinking about articulation and equivalency (for an example, see "Sample Steps" on page 22), as well as a joint course in electrical engineering. The partners developed this joint course as a series of guest lectures delivered by faculty members representing all project partners.

INSTRUMENT 8: "Full-time Equivalency at Home Institution Is Deemed Comparable to Full-time Equivalency at Host Institution." Institutions agreeing to this concept grant full, one-year credit at home for one year of study abroad (for example, the University of Illinois at Chicago). Another approach allows a full courseload at the home institution to equal a full courseload at the host institution, and awards 15 credits for a semester (for example, Canisius College).

INSTRUMENT 9: Using the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). Using templates developed by the European Union for ease of course comparison between and among European countries, a few U.S. institutions seek to apply this mechanism to facilitate course recognition between U.S. and European institutions.

It is important to recognize that educators in Europe developed the ECTS as an effort to emulate what U.S. higher education already has–a numerical weight, rating, or valuation for each course through assigning a certain number of credits to each course. One way that educators use ECTS in the United States is to establish what constitutes a full courseload. Once key project developers determine a full courseload, the credit value of a particular course may be derived as a proportion of the whole. Additionally, ECTS models, as designed for use among European institutions, may help U.S. institutions assign unit value to a particular course because they provide

A number of U.S. institutions are working together to create one or more joint courses or a joint curriculum with an overseas partner.

a uniform format for outlining course content and requirements (see Instrument 3 in preceding pages). This shared course description creates "transparency" regarding course content, and thereby helps institutions assess course credit or unit value. (For a general description of ECTS, see "Other Frameworks.")

Examples:

- At Orange Coast College, in a program designed to develop an international undergraduate certificate in several technical fields (electronics/semiconductor technology, information technology, and tourism/theme park management), the faculty described to their overseas partners the content of courses and agreed on the equivalence of 160 European hours to three U.S. credits. They seek to develop skills-based equivalencies in technical and vocational fields to ease transnational training between U.S. and European institutions.
- San Diego State University, in a program that has been developing a dual and then trilateral degree in business, uses existing systems such as ECTS to compare course credits.
- The University of Illinois at Chicago, in a program to globalize students' experience in Research and Development, uses ECTS for grades, as ECTS has a 1 to 5 scale that matches the university's own grading scale.
- The ATLAS program of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, promoting cooperation in engineering and the environment, uses ECTS units as outlined in a "Credit Transfer Table" that the institution has developed (the ECTS credit equals 60 credits for one year of full-time study). Program coordinators convened the five partners in the United States and Europe; sent course descriptions to one another–including course outlines, textbooks, and other information about courses; and determined which courses were comparable.

Regarding unit valuations, one rough translation from ECTS to U.S. credits is a 2:1 ratio. For example, between 180 and 240 ECTS hours are considered equivalent to a bachelor of arts degree, that is, approximately 120 U.S. credit hours.

INSTRUMENT 10: Developing a Joint or Dual Degree. Some FIPSE-funded programs have developed, or are seeking to develop, joint or dual degrees between their institution and one abroad. Although partners may establish these joint or dual degrees for purposes other than to ease credit or course recognition, they may ease problems surrounding course and credit recognition in the long run.

Examples:

- San Diego State University is currently working to expand its existing bilateral North American degree to a trilateral one. In the process, they likely will override the need for case-by-case and course-by-course approvals in the long run.
- The University of Rhode Island's five-year dual degree program in engineering with German institutions provides stringent curriculum, training in multiple languages, and internships for credit. The program also is designed to increase minority participation and to appeal to employers.
- The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, in conjunction with the University of Washington–Seattle and Duke University, has developed a joint master of arts degree in transatlantic studies with several European institutions: the University of Bath–UK, Université de Paris III, Universität–Berlin, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Universitá degli Studi di Siena, and Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.
- The University of Illinois at Chicago awards dual degrees in engineering with its lead partner institution in Italy, Politecnico di Milano.
- The University of Western Illinois recently launched a trilateral MBA program. This effort evolved from a FIPSE-supported program under which the university determined, over two years, the courses and curriculum for this degree. Project directors developed curriculum within specific stated fields (for example, strategic management, logistics, Internet marketing, and accounting practices). Faculty also will participate in a semester abroad to reassess content and prepare for their own teaching within this program. The home institution grants the degree, but the goal is one diploma with three seals.

While joint, dual, or multiple degree programs may not ease the recognition of courses and internships, and while they do require extensive effort to develop, they contribute to the broader goal of facilitating the recognition of academic study and internships across borders, easing the portability of the international experience.

INSTRUMENT 11: Special Category/Rubric for Recording. Institutions create a rubric or moniker (or they use an existing generic category) to cover the international study and/or internship experience. Examples of rubrics, existing or manufactured, under which credit is granted on return include "elective course," "research," and "independent study." One institution developed a "dummy course" as a recording mechanism. In a similar effort, another adjusts the overseas course description to fit into an existing course at the home institution. (These examples include programs within and beyond the matrix of "select" projects.)

INSTRUMENT 12: Special Course Number Developed for Study-abroad Course. Some institutions designate a special course number as a general slot under which any credit can be granted for overseas study or internships. For example, any history course undertaken overseas would be labeled "History 378."

INSTRUMENT 13: Pre-departure Agreements. Prior to leaving for international study and/or an internship abroad, each student secures from her/his advisor a written document pre-approving a course, group of courses, or internship that, if successfully completed, will be recognized for the amount of credit agreed on his or her return (see the examples in Appendices 9 and 10).

SAMPLE STEPS

In approaching articulation and comparability of courses and/or credits, institutions may undertake a methodical process, a series of steps to systematize discussion. These three samples apply to fields and types of institutions other than those illustrated above.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute is involved in "Developing a New Generation of Transatlantic Industrial Partners," a project that links U.S. and EU engineering schools to strengthen the future workforce on both sides of the Atlantic (and builds on an earlier Global E^3 program). This partnership began with a generic and flexible set of core questions, worked toward an articulation plan, and soon determined that a common template was not feasible, based on diversity at national, university, and disciplinary levels. The partners therefore started evaluating a number of required engineering courses, and also developed and piloted a jointly developed, jointly taught course.

The teams were guided by specific articulation questions:

- What are the curricular requirements up to the European master's level, and how do they compare to U.S. program requirements?
- What courses, individual or combined, are equivalent to courses in U.S. engineering programs?
- What is the sequence, scheduling, and availability of required courses, and how might this affect exchange students?
- What is the academic calendar, and how will this affect exchanges?
- What are the examination procedures, grading practices, and distribution of grades, and what problems do they pose for U.S. institutions and students?
- What types of internships in industry or university labs are actually available? What must a student do to secure an internship? What is the learning content? How is the work supervised? Is the learning experience suitable for academic credit?
- What are the possibilities for team-taught lectures or courses?
- Can improvements be made in the exchange process?

To deal with course and credit equivalencies, the teams developed a procedure for comparing study hours and determining credit equivalency:

1. Place the program in context. Determine student entry level, prerequisite knowledge, and other programs offered in the same faculty. Identify co-requisite and subsequent courses that are linked to the course in question.
2. Examine syllabi for topical similarities and differences, learning activities, and learning objectives. If necessary, adjust the hours for assignments, projects, or practical work that are not included in the nominal study hours for the course.
3. Determine whether the host institution should combine the course in question with another course, to make it equivalent to a course in the home curriculum.
4. Determine the total contact hours for the European and U.S. programs, then calculate the ratio of hours between the two. Make adjustments for elements and hours in European programs that have no equivalent in the U.S. program (for example, hours assigned for a mandatory internship and thesis).
5. If necessary, narrow the comparison to a year, term, or topical set of courses.
6. Use the ratio to convert the European course hours to U.S.-equivalent hours.

The University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) is a partner in the Student Transatlantic Engineering Program (STEP), which exposes students to a spectrum of research and development experiences and advises novice project directors in the following ways:

1. The project director must determine the emphasis: Is the program focused on education (institutional, undergraduate), research (individual professors), or faculty and student exchanges? If the program emphasizes research, the project needs laboratories.
2. The project director needs to state clearly the student learning objectives for the program: what he or she hopes students will accomplish–for example, learn global engineering, technical skills, or language and culture.
3. The project director must determine his or her objectives in course recognition: Is he or she trying to equalize programs, courses, or credit?
4. Since program relevance affects program sustainability, it is essential to talk to the human resources people in industry, seek internships, and, in the case of engineering, involve industry in developing "global engineering."
5. Then it is important to ask: How do you rationalize the assessment process to assign credits? Since differences in academic credit and time to degree exist between educa-

In approaching articulation and comparability of courses and/or credits, institutions may undertake a methodical process, a series of steps to systematize discussion.

tional systems, should we rationalize grades (with a literal translation), or should we consider a system of equivalencies? Employers want to see both.

6. UIC uses cumulative education–for example, three years in Italy is equivalent to the hours required for a U.S. bachelor of arts degree. Instead of equating credits or courses, the university matches "full-load" here against "full-load" there; one full-load year in Milan equals one full-load year at UIC.
7. The key question is how to synchronize calendars–terms, semesters, and quarters may be asynchronous; vacations and holidays differ in timing and duration. The project director needs to define application deadlines carefully and be clear about synchronization issues.
8. Joint MOU or other formal joint agreements can be either meaningless pieces of paper or thoughtful documents. To be useful, they should allow flexibility, provide room for change, exclude legalistic language, and not be constricting.
9. In the case of this particular program, project directors have made it possible for the student to earn double degrees–that is, degrees awarded from both the home and host institutions. Equivalencies are built into programs against one to two years of overseas study. For example, Italian students study at UIC for a set period, return home and receive two degrees; U.S. students go to Italy during their junior or senior year, study and complete internships, return home, and receive two degrees.
10. The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) accredits this program.
11. To satisfy internal record-keeping requirements, project directors manufactured course titles. Their equivalency focuses on programs rather than courses.
12. The program's strength and challenge is that it is based on trust. Although it is strong and resilient, it may not be easily transferable if the project director leaves.
13. The greatest way for program directors to attain program sustainability is to involve as many faculty members as possible, bring people together, and garner as much support as possible from people at their institution who are widely respected. Also, project directors should engage industry; business leaders can help support the program and may provide internships.

Front Range Community College, at its North American Student Exchange in Environmental Technology and Business Management conference, convened participants who came up with the following conclusions regarding articulation agreements:

1. The group agreed that it would develop a written and signed document ("Platform Agreement") among all colleges detailing program requirements, articulation agreements, and application procedures for entry into various study-abroad programs.
2. Participants also agreed that a course-by-course articulation agreement is not necessary because the enrollment for courses and internships is at the home institution and because the curriculum will be customized to each student's needs.
3. The course curriculum is a customized, negotiated training plan between the host and the home institution involving the student.
4. An institution and student may choose to participate in the program during any semester within a given calendar year in which the host institution offers the program, including summer semesters.
5. Credit hours/contact hours (terms) are similar for each institution (anywhere from one credit hour to 14–16 contact hours); therefore, partners detected no problems between institutional requirements for students.
6. The grading systems among the colleges were also similar. Mexican institutions' grades are based on a 1 to 10 scale and can be adapted to the American/Canadian A to F (4.0 to 0.0) grading system. (In this system, a particular individual must provide a one-page document indicating grade equivalency between institutions.)
7. Credit for internships will be set at either 3 or 6 credit hours. The number of hours will be defined between the host and home institution with a written project requirement to be completed. A grade will be awarded for the semester's internship.
8. Each student is expected to carry a full load (as defined by the home institution), including coursework and internship. This will help resolve any financial aid issues.

Recording Grades or Credit: Bases for Determining Equivalency or Comparability

ACE researchers found that institutions employ a wide range of approaches to the recording of grades or credit alone, without grades, as well as to the way they determine equivalency to fit each institution's needs. Sample approaches include:

- Only credits are recorded (Eckerd College).
- Grades are recorded.
  - Faculty members are familiar with one another's grading systems and know how to translate the host institution's grade to the home institution's grading scale.
  - The host institution sends the evaluation and grade to the home institution, which then inserts grades using a manufactured course number.
  - The Admissions and Records office uses information from the *World Education Series* books.
  - The home institution notes grades recorded and counts them toward the GPA.
- Grades are recorded but do not affect the GPA (University of Houston).
- Grades are included on the record from the host institution but are not recorded on the home institution's transcript or included in the GPA (Kettering).
- Courses can be taken for grades or for credits only. Most students request grades. Faculty determine grades based on the host faculty's evaluation (Orange Coast).
- Letter grades or "pass/no pass" are recorded. Project directors understand the value of grades at each participating institution. Home institutions may consult registrars in the event of confusion over grades (Oregon Health Sciences).
- Grades are translated through an equivalency matrix created and agreed upon by participating faculty members and directors of international education (Western Illinois University).
- Grades are recorded using the ECTS 1 to 5 scale, which matches the university's grading system (University of Illinois at Chicago).

Because individual nations, institutions, and faculty may use different approaches to grading, the original agreement should include a provision for receiving a grade distribution chart or curve along with the student's grade at the end of the semester. This document not only will provide guidance on the meaning of the letter or number grade, but also will prove useful for interpreting coursework undertaken at the same institution in the future.

External Standards and Requirements: The Role of Professional Accreditation, Certification, and Licensing

Since a number of professional fields are governed in part by standards or requirements externally set by professional accreditation, certification, or licensing organizations, it was important to learn whether programs were affected (or project directors believed they might be affected) by these external bodies and requirements, as well as how sample associations viewed transnational mobility issues.

Regional trade agreements, including those among North American countries and among European countries, have spurred dialogue within each region on the reduction of boundaries to assess quality and competency in education in the professions. A number of professions have been exploring ways to develop agreements for mutual recognition of licensed professionals in North America.[1]

A full discussion of professional and specialized accrediting issues surpasses the scope of this guide, but for further information on efforts within professions such as engineering, architecture, accounting, nursing, and other fields, see papers compiled in publications listed in Appendix 13, or contact the respective specialized accrediting association. Also, consult the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) web site at http:// www.chea .org or the *CHEA Almanac* for further information on specialized accrediting associations.

1. Examples of professional or specialized accreditors' international engagement in key fields of professional exchange.

The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET),[2] a federation of professional engineering societies, has worked actively to ensure quality in engineering education for more than 60 years. For more than 20 years, ABET has engaged internationally in mutual recognition agreements, program evaluations (not accreditations), education consulting visits, and assistance in developing accreditation systems in other countries. ABET recently launched a credentials evaluation service.

Regional trade agreements, including those among North American countries and among European countries, have spurred dialogue within each region on the reduction of boundaries to assess quality and competency in education in the professions.

ABET's criteria for accreditation include the expectation that "graduates have the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context." Yet this outline does not specify the means by which institutions aim to achieve this goal. ABET allows schools the latitude to tailor their curricula to address international issues as they apply to specific areas of study.

One significant product of ABET's international mutual recognition efforts, a six-nation agreement on the "substantial equivalency" of respective accreditation processes, has emerged and evolved into the *Washington Accord*, a document described on page 59.

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, or AACSB International, serves as the accrediting agency for degree programs in business administration and accounting.

AACSB does not believe that anything in its current policies would hinder a student from earning credit for study-abroad opportunities. As a condition of membership, AACSB specifies that the business program must include international aspects.

To incorporate what AACSB has learned in accrediting institutions outside the United States, it is now rewriting the standards and redeveloping the curriculum based on the concept of "assurance of learning," that is, a focus on achievements or outcomes rather than intentions. AACSB views this approach as obviating the need for determining comparability of courses, credits, or modules, or translating these into credit hours. The organization also will require that the curriculum provide an international perspective and context on ethical and global issues (see the AACSB web site at http://www.aacsb.edu).

In another approach to quality assurance, the American Institute of Architects Continuing Education System (AIA/CES) offers a way to fulfill U.S. continuing education requirements overseas through its network of accepted providers. This system of "Registered Providers" includes only those organizations that have applied for such status and met all the AIA/CES guidelines and criteria, and provides another model of an approach to quality assurance.[3]

Efforts to engage internationally in other fields of professional education also have been undertaken by associations for accounting, nursing and nurse anesthesia education, occupational therapy, and K–12 teaching (especially in special education).[4] Recognizing equivalency of specialized and professional accreditation among associations in the United States and foreign countries is not yet common practice, but it is increasingly encouraged.[5]

2. Impact of quality assurance agencies or organizations on consortial programs; issues of licensing and certification.

At the institutional program level, project directors in a range of programs agreed that issues of specialized accreditation did not create a barrier to international professional exchange; but state-level licensing and certification issues might, in some cases, affect professional education.

Faculty of engineering programs note that ABET's criteria have not presented any problems for them; in fact, one faculty member noted that ABET took some lead from what his institution was doing internationally. In another program, a project director reported that the registrar was concerned that adding study-abroad courses would affect regional accreditors' future decisions on institutional accreditation, a fear that ended up having very little foundation.

While specialized accreditation standards appear not to impede international professional exchange, certification and licensure mechanisms–by requiring a specific course of study and set of courses–may limit recognition of study-abroad courses.

State licensure–the legal permission for an individual to be licensed or certified to practice in a particular field–usually is required when the health or safety of clients is involved. An authority or agency in each state issues licenses. Licensure often, but not always, requires specifying a particular program of study, as well as successfully completing an examination. It may require that a degree be granted by an accredited institution.

In teacher education, a field strictly controlled by state agencies, FIPSE-funded consortial programs provided no obvious examples of professional exchange. However, research revealed two examples of other programs, one at Georgia State University and one at the University of Wisconsin, Whitewater, that were conducted in the field of teacher education. These exchanges occurred without penalty to students engaged in international experiences, but institutions offered them as an addition to, not in lieu of, the required course of study.

From the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the association that represents state agencies responsible for teacher certification, ACE learned that there is no single answer to if and how states accept international credit: Each state sets its own requirements. In conversation with state certification offices, ACE researchers found that recognition of credit from study abroad depends on the regulations of each state. Each state that ACE interviewed accepted credit for study abroad, provided that it recognized the institution that awarded the student his or her degree. For instance, California accepts the credit recommendations of the student's home institution; it does not automatically accept foreign transcripts. If a student earns a

In conversation with state certification offices, ACE researchers found that recognition of credit from study abroad depends on the regulations of each state.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

degree from a foreign institution, a foreign transcript evaluator must review that degree and the coursework involved. The state then makes a determination to recognize the credits based on the evaluation. In contrast, Michigan recognizes the recommendations of the student's home university for courses completed abroad, but it does not accept credit for student teaching done abroad unless an instructor from the home institution supervised and evaluated that student. The university does not recognize any student teaching observed and evaluated solely by instructors at the host institution. Idaho also adheres to the policy of accepting the recommendation of a certification candidate's home university for instruction abroad, but it will only recognize courses taken in the United States in the pursuit of certification renewal. It does not accept courses taken at institutions outside the United States.

Full discussion of state licensure or certification issues also surpasses the scope of this guide, but because these issues have a real or imagined impact on professional education, consider one example: In Oregon, a serious challenge to credit for certification based in international experience stimulated one university to launch a successful effort to change state law. Professional nursing training at Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU) requires that students practice in clinical settings, and the completion of such experience is a qualifying factor that allows them to practice and be covered by the State Board of Nursing. Because the state licensing body experienced difficulty recognizing that international experiences were comparable to those in Oregon, OHSU project directors approached the state legislature about changing state laws. As a result of university efforts, the state passed new legislation that recognizes comparability of courses outside the United States. It also recognizes the reciprocal understanding that limited licenses may be offered to international students studying at OHSU to perform certain functions of practical experience. While this dramatic example of project initiative may be unique, it indicates the possibilities for "pushing the envelope" in the development of innovative programming.

Note: See *Other Frameworks for Credit Recognition and Quality Assurance*, Appendix 11.

References

1. Ascher, Bernard. "Education and the Professions: International Activities, Products and By-Products." *The Foundation of Globalization of Higher Education and the Professions.* Washington, DC: The Center for Quality Assurance in International Education. 1999.

2. Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. *2001–2002 Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs.* Baltimore, MD: ABET, 2001.

3. Kane, Kay and Johnson, Mark. "Global Partnerships: The American Institute of Architects Continuing Education System." *Quality Assurance of Higher Education and Professional Practice in the Global Context.* Washington, DC: The Center for Quality Assurance, 2001, 26–30.

4. Interview with Steven Hunt of the National Library of Education, February 14, 2002.

5. Yopp, John. "Reduction of Cultural Boundaries of Quality and Competency Assurance Through Cross-Cultural Reform, Test Adaptation, and Diversity Enhancement." *Quality Assurance of Higher Education and Professional Practice in the Global Context.* Washington, DC: The Center for Quality Assurance, 2001, 126–147.

Looking Ahead

As higher education faces a challenging and ever-changing future, new cooperative endeavors and emerging trends may aid and advance the portability of overseas study and experience.

Cooperative Endeavors

The Internet offers opportunities to leverage program experience into shared data banks and lessons. Electronic sites hosted by professional associations, nonprofit organizations, individual institutions, or government agencies could provide a locus for shared information that would ease the portability of courses and internships. Concepts could include:

- A web site for posting sample documents and lessons learned. The site would contain a growing body of strategies, practices, and approaches that work, as well as supporting documents.
- An electronic "shell"–a web-based template for collecting national data on overseas courses accepted for credit by U.S. institutions that could serve as a guide or ease the process for other institutions. For example, U.S. Institution A accepts domestic transfer credit from U.S. Institution B. U.S. Institution B accepts overseas credit from German University C. As a result, University A may feel more comfortable in accepting credit from University C without undergoing a time-consuming process. (For an example of this concept, see the discussion of Global E^3 on page 18.)
- Time savings. Institutions can save precious time in the creation, negotiation, and interchange of new documents by using this shell or other means to develop outlines, forms, or checklists for reporting and exchanging course/internship information, and to develop grading systems and distribution by providing more uniform or consistent data.
- Capitalizing on good practices emerging in new and evolving areas of higher education, other than international exchange, that offer useful examples of addressing credit portability. Many activities may deal with issues that bear on the portability of international credit–for example, domestic programs for

The Internet offers opportunities to leverage program experience into shared data banks and lessons. Electronic sites hosted by professional associations, nonprofit organizations, individual institutions, or government agencies could provide a locus for shared information that would ease the portability of courses and internships.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

course or degree sharing across or within state lines; articulation agreements between community and four-year colleges; and distance education course crediting (see Appendix 11 for some more specific examples).

Trends that May Affect Credit Recognition

As professionals in the field look ahead, they see trends that may affect credit recognition in the future:

- Emerging emphases on new assessment tools that are outcome- and competency-based, rather than input- and content-based. A number of professional fields are moving in this direction.
- New means to assess and recognize other forms of transnational education, such as distance education, that may apply to other studies.
- The search for consistent ways to evaluate international credentials and experience.
- Efforts in other countries to develop a U.S. model of higher education.
- The impact of trade and immigration on state licensing and certification.
- Creation of joint and dual degrees that may obviate the need for a credit recognition process.
- Use of the web for curriculum development and jointly developed coursework.
- Using the Internet to address potential problems, such as delays in receiving grades and transcripts, by having documents first sent electronically, with official print/hard copy following. This medium would also promote regular communication among partners.
- Mandated international experience built into U.S. degree programs.

Conclusion

The suggestions outlined in this guide can provide a foundation upon which a credit recognition system can be built. Although all study-abroad programs are unique and vary by institution, this publication can serve as a blueprint for thinking systematically about processes. A wide variety of disciplines and majors, as well as institutional types, were examined; despite that diversity, all institutions found many common practices to be useful. Perhaps most important, all project directors agreed that building trust and maintaining frequent and open communication are pivotal to success.

It is crucial that colleges and universities develop mechanisms to articulate and facilitate credit recognition. As globalization continues to exert a powerful force in the world, increasing numbers of students will come to value the benefits of study and internships abroad and will enroll in institutions that support straightforward recognition of international experience.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendices

Appendix 1

Sample Meeting Agenda

Initial Meeting of Consortial Exchange Participants

I. Introduce participating faculty and administrators.

II. Review curriculum content.
(This discussion provides an opportunity for faculty at each institution to understand the precise subject matter that the curriculum will cover, as well as expected student outcomes.)

III. Create course comparison modules.
(See Appendix 8.)

IV. Establish credit equivalencies.

V. Develop academic approval form.
(See Appendix 9.)

VI. Develop Memorandum of Understanding that articulates the award of credit.
(See Appendix 6.)

VII. Establish schedule and medium for continued communication.
(e.g., e-mail listservs, regularly scheduled conference calls, annual meetings, etc.)

Appendix 2

Sample Work Plan

- Plan and provide at the outset for an extensive, substantive, face-to-face meeting among faculty and administrators representing all partners to develop trust, comfortable communication, and initial understandings about how to proceed with agreements.

- Allow time to learn what different countries/institutions mean by their grades and credits to clarify terms, understand educational systems and contexts, and create a common language.

- Recognize that the negotiation process is itself infused with cultural differences–sometimes unrecognized–in assumptions, approaches, and uses of terminology that shape the formation and implementation of agreements and programs.

- Develop a tight, timed agenda for the meeting and state expected outcomes.

- Include a session for sharing course/program outlines and contents to determine how to compare and assess courses, curricula, and/or programs.

- During visits, faculty and administrators tour one another's facilities (e.g., classrooms, libraries, and labs), and have the opportunity to ask questions and build trust and confidence.

- Clarify among partners (and within each home institution) the financial and legal issues and implications surrounding credits, courses, fees, and waivers.

- Draft a specific work plan, timetable, deadlines, and activity sequence, and assign responsibilities.

- Upon returning home, continue to work with appropriate institutional parties at the home institution to develop buy-in and internal agreement on equivalencies or comparability of courses and credits, or other approaches agreeable to all concerned.

- Establish a plan for mode and frequency of communication among and between partners, including scheduled in-person meetings, methods for establishing electronic connections, and commitment to keeping open lines of communication to avoid misunderstanding or escalating issues.

- Reconnect all partners to develop and review written understandings about all aspects of exchange, including credit or course recognition, in person or electronically.

- Finalize formal written documents–MOUs and specific agreements–for signatures either among all partners or bilaterally. (Ensure this process is clear to all participants.)

- Provide for translation of documents among languages.

For outlines, guides, or checklists regarding some of the items above, refer to respective appendices.

Appendix 3

Checklist of Campus Personnel Who Are Key to Successful Credit Recognition
(Varies greatly by institution)

Project/Program Director

Student's Academic Advisor

Department Chair for Academic Programs

Dean or Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

Faculty Senate

Study-abroad Professional

International Division of Student Services

International Admissions Office

Registrar

Legal Staff

Central Administration (as appropriate)

Appendix 4

Sample Memorandum of Understanding

Memorandum of Understanding
Between Institution A and Institution B

The purpose of this agreement is to promote international understanding and scholarly collaboration between Institution A and Institution B. Institution A, represented by President A, and Institution B, represented by President B, have agreed to the following:

1. Within the framework of this exchange, "home university" will mean the institution in which a student is formally enrolled as a degree candidate, and "host university" will mean the institution that has agreed to receive students from the home institution for a period of study.
2. The respective university offices administering the exchange will provide for the availability of academic advising to assist students in selecting appropriate courses, seminars, internships, and other appropriate learning experiences.
3. Participants in the exchange will be governed by the same regulations and performance standards as pertain to students at the host university.
4. Enrollment reports and academic achievement evaluations will be sent to the student's home university during each term.
5. Participants will remain registered at their home institution or enroll directly in the host institution.
6. The present MOU will be supplemented by agreements in specific academic disciplines signed by representatives of both institutions.
7. The present MOU will be supplemented by an articulation agreement, which will detail how credit for overseas study will be recognized by the home institution.
8. This agreement is subject to review at the end of the first year and shall be effective for ___ years, subject to revision or modification by mutual written agreement, unless terminated by either party in the form of a written notice submitted at least eight months in advance of the academic year in which the termination is to become effective.

Signed for and on behalf of:

Institution A	Institution B
_____	_____
Representative/Title	Representative/Title
_____	_____
Date	Date

(Composite document based on multiple samples.)

Appendix 5

Sample Memorandum of Agreement 1

Memorandum of Agreement
Between
Foreign Institution
City, State/Province Country
and
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas, United States of America

Whereas the above named institutions recognize that a Memorandum of Agreement would be of mutual benefit and would serve as an indication of continued interest in cooperation, it is understood that:

1. Each institution will promote the exchange of faculty for joint teaching and research programs.
2. Each institution will promote the exchange of qualified (choose one) [undergraduate/graduate/undergraduate and graduate] students enrolled in degree programs. With such exchanges, each student will be subject to the admission requirements and tuition and fees of the host university, or the admission requirements enumerated in supplements to this agreement.
3. Faculty from each institution will collaborate in producing proposals for external funding, as appropriate.
4. Any expenses incurred by each institution under this agreement will be the sole responsibility of the divisions of the institution, as enumerated in supplements to this agreement.
5. This Memorandum of Agreement will become effective on the date of signing and will have a duration of five years.

In Affirmation, signed this day of _____ of _____, 200_.

_____	_____
President	Rector/Equivalent Title
Texas A & M University	Foreign University

(Note: Statements above are examples. Adjust as appropriate.)

Appendix 6

Sample Memorandum of Agreement 2

Memorandum of Agreement
Concerning the Educational, Research, and Services
Cooperation and Exchange
Between Other College
and
Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina
In the United States of America

General Statement of Purpose

The above named jointly agree to develop the programs described below and agree to implement these programs in accordance with appropriate state and federal laws and regulations of the home country and institutions represented. The purpose of such endeavor is to enhance mutually beneficial exchange between these institutions, promote the advancement of education, research, and services, and strengthen friendly cooperation between the institutions. The cooperation between institutions should be based on principles of mutual benefit and legality.

Objectives

In order to promote international cooperation and foster mutual interests in the fields of higher education, research, and services, Other College (OC) and Clemson University (CU), hereafter collectively referred to as the "institutions," agree to cooperate in the following activities as and when appropriate.

Student Exchange

Statement of Purpose

The institutions will develop and conduct a student exchange program offering coursework, prescribed study activities, projects, and research that are directed at the preparation of highly qualified and internationally aware graduates. The program shall be pursued in accordance with the conditions noted below.

Participant Eligibility

Students eligible to participate in this exchange must have completed two academic years for undergraduate students or have obtained a bachelor's degree or its equivalent for graduate students and must meet other academic standards as required by the hosting institution. Students eligible to participate in this

exchange must receive the written recommendation of an academic advisor of the sending institution, and the written approval of a department chair of the receiving institution. Students coming to the United States are required to maintain health insurance for their entire period in the country. Failure to meet this insurance requirement will result in termination of visa status and return to the home country.

Selection and Admission of Students

Application must be made on the hosting institution's application form and required credentials should be forwarded with the application. The decision for admission will be sent to students by the designated office of the hosting institution, with a copy of each notice being sent to the designated office at the home institution. Coordination of this exchange will be the joint responsibility of the respective designated offices at each institution. For Clemson University, International Services and Diversity Programs will manage this coordination.

Guidance Materials

Guidance material containing programs of study, coursework, research, field experience, and other pertinent information will be prepared by each institution and made available to interested students through the other institution's designated office. Coursework offered by each institution will be identified by certification agencies and/or faculty as meeting respective certification and/or degree requirements.

Benefits of the Exchange Program

Incoming exchange students will be provided, whenever possible, on-campus or university-approved housing, full-time enrollment in courses, orientation, academic advising, and all other services provided to regularly enrolled students.

Award of Grades and Credit

Not more than one calendar month after the exchange student has completed study, the host institution shall send to the home institution a transcript detailing the courses the student has taken, the number of credit hours the student has received in each course, and the grade earned in each course. Provision of course syllabi will be the responsibility of the participating student.

(Adapted from Clemson University documents.)

Appendix 7

The Comprehensive Agreement: Checklist of Topics to Consider in Drafting an MOU

One comprehensive document should be signed by all academic partners. Its purpose is to clarify any local variations from a general agreement and to recognize the role of nonacademic partners. The agreement should be completed and signed early in the first year of the project to ensure early recognition of guidelines within each institution.

Background

- Nature of the project

Clauses

- Objectives
- Balance
- Participants
- Student status
- Selection of students
- Credit recognition
- Language requirements
- Commitment of resources
  - Amount of student support
  - Tuition and fees
- Other program costs
  - Health coverage
  - Travel
  - Local details
- Housing
- Internships
- Student responsibilities upon completion
- Officials responsible
- Program review
- Equal opportunity statement
- Future cooperation

Dates, duration, and future institutional arrangements

Additional guidelines by participating institutions
(i.e., local variations on general agreements)

- TOEFL scores
- Individual program regulations
- Calculation of balance
- Visa status

Signatures/Approvals

(Adapted from a presentation by Michael Moss, University of Guelph, October 2001.)

Appendix 8

Sample Program/Modular Equivalency

Business Administration Transfer AA Degree

AREA: Prep for Business Major				
CLASS	CSU GEN ED	UNITS	STATUS	Agreement
Accounting 116A		4	Approved	Neils Brock Accounting and comparative written analysis of US 7 European Corporation reporting and disclosure requirements.
Accounting 116B		4	Approved	Competencies met in Neils Brock Accounting and Finance and additional reading assignments.
Business 119		3	Approved	
Economics 120	Area D2	3	Approved	
Economics 121	Area D2	3	Approved	Neils Brock Economics & Business Plan and additional reading assignments.
Business 140		3	Approved	
Philosophy 102B	C2	3	Approved	
CISC 180, 180L		4	Approved	
Mathematics 121	Area B4	3	Pending	Gymnasium Level A & application of math in Neils Brock such as economic models
TOTAL UNITS Prep for Major		33		
AREA: Other CSU General Education				
Speech 103	Area A1	3	Pending	Use Marketing as speech application and Management Information & Business Plan presentation; need course outlines from Marketing and Management Information.
English 105	Area A2	3	Approved	Gymnasium Level A and copies of sample student work, Neils Brock written assignments and texts used, Neils Brock Business English outline and revision of the Business English outline that reflects students do documentation.
English 205	Area A3	3	Approved	Phil & Law & Business Plan & copies of student work and same situations on all work & Business English outline & samples of assignments.
Physical Science/Lab	Area B1, B3	7	Pending Approved	Physical Sci 100/101, Geo 101/L, Physics 120A/B & 121 A/B at Gymnasium Level A & copies of lab reports and texts used. Chem 100/100L
Life Science	B2	3	Pending	Bio 107 is a possibility, Bio 101 doesn't appear to be a match, but requested copied of texts & lab reports for both.
Music	C1	3	Pending	Gymnasium Level A.
French, Spanish, German	C2	3	Pending	Gymnasium Level A.
Social Science	Area D1-D0	3	Pending	Econ 120/121 & History 109 from Gymnasium & Texts & copies of written assignments.
Speech 180	Area E	3	Approved	Oral requirements across the Neils Brock curriculum & Phil/cross-cultural studies.
TOTAL UNITS for Transfer AA Degree		63		(International Business Administration-Denmark-status)

(Adapted from San Diego City College document.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 9

Sample Pre-departure Agreement 1

Pre-departure Study Abroad Credit Agreement—Student Summary

Name: _____
Semester/Year: _____

	Home University	Host University	
University:	_____	_____	
Courses:	Recommended	Taken	Grade/Credit
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

Award of (circle one): Grades Credits

Head of Program: _____
Telephone: _____
E-mail: _____
Signature Approval: _____

Student Advisor: _____
Telephone: _____
E-mail: _____
Signature Approval: _____

Student: _____
Telephone: _____
E-mail: _____
Signature Approval: _____

Registrar (as needed): _____
Telephone: _____
E-mail: _____
Signature Approval: _____

Additional Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix 10

Sample Pre-departure Agreement 2

Michigan State University

Exchange Preparation Checklist

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Partner Institution: _____

Main contact for exchange at partner institution:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Primary person at Michigan State University who is proposing this exchange:

Name: _____

Department: _____

Phone: _____

Duration of proposed exchange agreement: _____

Duration of student stay at partner institution (e.g., semester, summer only, academic year):

Inbound student(s): _____

Outbound student(s): _____

Level of exchange (check one):

____ All-university

____ College(s) (specify): _____

____ Department(s) (specify): _____

Proposed field(s) of study:

At Michigan State University: _____

At partner institution: _____

Types of students eligible (check all that apply):

Inbound	Outbound	
_____	_____	Graduate students
_____	_____	Undergraduate students
_____	_____	Medical students
_____	_____	Adults/Professionals
_____	_____	Other: _____

Rationale:

Why is this exchange needed? Can students get a similar experience through any existing exchange or study abroad program? Apart from its impact on individual participating students, what are the potential benefits to MSU?

_____

_____

_____

Faculty:

MSU Faculty—Is any support for travel and/or accommodation planned?

____ Yes ____ No. If yes, explain amount, source, duration, and reason.

_____

_____

_____

Visiting Faculty—Is any support for travel and/or accommodation planned?

____ Yes ____ No. If yes, explain amount, source, duration, and reason.

_____

_____

_____

II. CONSULTATION PROCESS

	Contact
Office of International Education Exchange regarding administration and procedures	_____
Office of International Education Exchange regarding visas, tuition scholarships, employment issues, orientation programs	_____
Department faculty	_____

	Contact
Department chair(s)	_____
College dean(s)	_____

III. APPROVAL PROCEDURES

	Contact/Date
Department/College	_____
Office of International Education Exchange	_____
ISP A/C Committee	_____
Provost's Office (when appropriate)	_____

IV. EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATION

Person with primary responsibility for:

	At MSU	At partner institution
Correspondence/ongoing liaison	_____	_____
Participant recruitment	_____	_____
Evaluation of partner institution courses for MSU equivalent	_____	_____
Participant selection	_____	_____
Evaluation of participant experience	_____	_____
Academic program evaluation	_____	_____
Follow-up for grades and posting of credit	_____	_____
Protocol issues (e.g., hosting visitors, renewing agreement)	_____	_____
Budget	_____	_____
Accounting support	_____	_____
Overall exchange administration	_____	_____

V. FUNDING

	Primary Funding Source	Additional Funding Source
Staff support	_____	_____
Supplies and expenses	_____	_____
Site evaluation and visits	_____	_____

VI. OVERSEAS STUDY STUDENT EXCHANGE MODELS

____ MSU Overseas Study (MSU courses with grade)

____ Non-MSU overseas study (transfer credit)

____ CIC Programs (MSU equivalents with grades)

____ Freiburg, Shiga (MSU equivalents with grades)

____ Exchange #1 (transfer credit)

____ New Exchange #2 (MSU equivalents with grades)

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TO STUDENTS

Person at MSU with primary responsibility:

	For inbound students	For outbound students
Admissions (distributing information, tracking applications)	_____	_____
Financial aid assistance	_____	_____
Tuition/fee collection	_____	_____
Pre-arrival correspondence	_____	_____
Housing arrangements	_____	_____
Arrival and reception	_____	_____
Orientation	_____	_____
Academic advising	_____	_____
Registration	_____	_____
Ongoing support programs	_____	_____
Personal health, other counseling	_____	_____
Grade processing/reporting	_____	_____

Note: In discussions with partner institutions (counterparts), determine and make note of which of the above services will be provided and by whom.

VIII. STUDENT FINANCES

	Source for inbound students	Source for outbound students
Tuition		
MSU Fees and "taxes"		
Room		
Meals		
International travel		
Insurance		
Incidental expenses (including local travel)		

IX. REGISTRATION AND CREDIT

How will coursework and credit be documented? (Check all that apply.)

Inbound	Outbound	
_____	_____	Grade report
_____	_____	Regular transcript
_____	_____	Faculty evaluation
_____	_____	Individual course certificates
_____	_____	No official documentation (course material only)

Other:_____

Appendix 11

Other Frameworks for Credit Recognition and Quality Assurance

Continuing efforts to harmonize higher education by creating coherence, compatibility, comparability, and/or convergence through mechanisms for "transparency," understandings on quality assurance, or other shared agreements or templates include:

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). Developed by the European Commission and its ERASMUS/SOCRATES program, ECTS is a system of academic credit allocation and transfer that facilitates the recognition of periods of study abroad for students and serves as a basis for a credit system for each student by allowing him or her to build a portfolio of credits. ECTS helps institutions enhance cooperation by improving access to information on foreign curricula and providing common procedures for academic recognition. This schema, a platform or framework for recognition, is based on the principle of mutual trust and confidence among the participating institutions. The rules of ECTS concern information on courses available, agreement between the home and host institutions, and the use of credit points to indicate student workload. Each ECTS department must describe the courses it offers not only in terms of content but also by assigning credits to each course (see http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/ects). The ERASMUS site also lists useful links to relevant organizations and institutions.

A similar EU system, LEONARDO, links vocational education content and curriculum to industry needs and standards. Orange Coast College is currently attempting to adapt this system to U.S. institutional needs for credit recognition of studies undertaken in Europe in technical or vocational fields. They are seeking to develop equivalencies between Orange Coast and European technical courses and to use a process in the United States that is based on Europe's system of establishing vocational requirements "from the shop floor up" by working with employers in the technical and vocational fields in which their students study.

The Central European Exchange Program for University Studies (CEEPUS) (http://www.oead.ac.at) and the Universal Credit Transfer Scheme (UCTS) of University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (http://www.umap.org) employ the same or similar mechanisms to those of ERASMUS/SOCRATES

ECTS, but for use within their respective geographic regions.

Also, supported by the EU and the European Commission, National Academic Recognition Information Centers (NARICs) review credentials and qualifications and make decisions regarding the comparability/equivalency of academic qualifications obtained in another country. Decisions of the NARICs follow the guidelines and procedures established under the Lisbon Convention as well as other agreements, and under guidelines of the EU, the Council of Europe, and UNESCO. (See http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/adnaric.htm.)

The Lisbon Convention. With the launching of ERASMUS/SOCRATES, German reunification, and the breakup of the former Soviet Union, the 1979 UNESCO "Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas, and Degrees Concerning Higher Education in the States Belonging to the Europe Region" no longer addressed current needs in Europe. That convention had been the sole forum for bringing together signatories of the Equivalence Conventions of the Council of Europe (dating from the 1950s and early 1960s) and specialists in academic recognition from countries in the UNESCO European Region. In 1992, the Council of Europe and UNESCO agreed to develop a joint convention to provide a framework for the recognition of academic qualifications. The joint Council of Europe/UNESCO "Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region" was signed in Lisbon in 1997 and was entered into force on February 2, 1999. In addition to establishing a framework for the recognition of academic qualifications among countries in the European Region, the Lisbon Convention mandates the establishment of national education information centers (ENICs) charged with providing information about education at all levels. The Lisbon Convention and the ENICs provide background to the development of the Diploma Supplement and the emerging cooperation in higher education called for in the 1999 *Bologna Declaration.* (See http://www.cepes.ro/information_services/sources/on_line/lisbon.htm.)

The U.S. responded to this new ENIC requirement by creating the U.S. Network of Education Information

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(USNEI) under the U.S. Department of Education's National Library of Education. (See http://www.ed.gov/NLE/USNEI.)

The Bologna Declaration and the Bologna Process. Following the 1998 *Sorbonne Declaration*, agreed upon by France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom, European Ministers of Education signed the Bologna Declaration in June 1999. This agreement calls for the creation of a "European Higher Education Area" through what has become known as the "Bologna Process." This process focuses on encouraging harmony within higher education in Europe through the adoption of a model based on a three-year bachelor's degree followed by a two-year master's degree. The parties wish to establish a system of academic credits (such as ECTS above) that would be easily transferable in order to promote student mobility and European cooperation. It moves Europe toward comparable degrees and cooperation in quality assurance. To further advance European higher education "harmonization, coherence, and convergence toward the goal of reducing barriers to transferring degrees and credits for academic work completed from one country to another," other meetings followed: the Salamanca Convention of European Higher Education (March 2001) and the Prague Meeting of Ministers of Education (May 2001). (For more information, see the CHEA web site at http://www.chea.org/international/multi-lateral and the Council of Rectors, Association of European Universities' web site at http://www.unige.ch/eua.)

European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). The Prague Meeting of Ministers of Education (May 2001) considered a collaboration between ENQA and corresponding bodies in countries not members of ENQA to be of great importance. The goal of such collaboration is to create a common frame of reference and articulate best practice in quality assurance. (For more information, see http://www.enqa.net.)

The National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Academic Credentials. The Council is a collaboration among several educational associations: the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO), the American Council on Education (ACE), The College Board, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), the Institute of International Education (IIE), and NAFSA: Association of International Educators. The Council works to establish standards for interpreting foreign educational credentials primarily for the benefit of academic institutions in the United States. The Council creates guidelines for assessing advanced standing/transfer credit for study completed in other countries. To these ends, the Council has approved

and made recommendations for the interpretation of foreign academic credentials that appear in publications such as the *World Education Series* and other interassociation publications. The Council also has participated in international meetings that involve foreign educational credentials, including planning meetings for the development of the *European Diploma Supplement.* (See http://www.ed.gov/NLE/USNEI/us/natcouncil-intro.html.)

The Washington Accord. This agreement recognizes the "substantial equivalency" of respective processes for accrediting engineering programs. It recognizes that the signatories' respective accreditation systems assess that the graduates of accredited programs are prepared to practice entry-level engineering. It sets criteria, policies, and procedures for accrediting academic programs in engineering and admits new members. (For more information, see http://www.engc.org.uk/spotlight/washington and the CHEA web site at http://www.chea.org/international/multi-lateral.)

European Diploma Supplement. This model was developed by the European Commission, Council of Europe, and UNESCO/CEPES. The supplement provides sufficient independent data to improve the international transparency and fair academic and professional recognition of qualifications (diplomas, degrees, certificates, and so forth). It describes the nature, level, context, content, and status of the studies that the student pursued and completed. It is designed to be free of value judgments or suggestions about recognition. (For more information, see the Academic Information Centre at http://www.aic.lv/ds.)

Global Engineering Program (Global E^3). This IIE-sponsored program provides that engineering students within member institutions (70 universities in 13 countries as of May 2001) receive credit from their home institutions for courses taken abroad, which students can then use toward a degree at their home university. The Global E^3 program also offers students internships. A web-based data bank tracks the engineering courses that Global E^3 students took while studying abroad, courses for which the home institution awarded credit. The data bank also maintains information on grading systems at each institution. (For more information, see Instrument 4 under "Implementation Strategies," or go to http://www.iie.org/pgms/global-e3.)

The Alberta Guide for Transfer Among Post Secondary Institutions. This document is an example of a Canadian effort to translate course-by-course equivalencies. It is available on the web at http://www.acat.gov.ab.ca. For a single province, the hard copy version for 2000–01 extends nearly 300 pages.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CREDIT PORTABILITY

Within the United States, attempts to address or ease credit recognition or transfer among U.S. institutions may provide models for grappling with the portability of credits internationally. Examples include:

The League for Innovation in the Community College. The League is developing guidelines for its member colleges to forge agreements with distance education institutions to facilitate community college students' transfer of course credits toward earning undergraduate degrees (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 29, 2001: A31). (For more information, see the guidelines at http://www.league.org/league/membership/articulations.)

The North Suburban (Chicago) Higher Education Consortium. In the joint degree program, the student selects the institution to award the diploma (assuming that the student has met the admissions criteria). Then, credits from collaborating institutions are transferred to the home institution to make a complete transcript at the degree-granting institution. The faculty approves the curriculum together and agrees to accept the credits from the other institutions. This consortium began through a formal, signed MOU among participating institutions. (For more information, contact Patricia Widmayer, Ph.D., Consortium Director, at p-widmayer@nwu.edu.)

Associated Colleges of Central Kansas. Six associated campuses in Kansas share four academic programs, with each institution treating shared courses and faculty as if they were located on that campus. Course descriptions, syllabi, and so forth are routed through respective campus governance processes for approval. (For more information, visit the web site at http://www.acck.edu or contact Ray Brown, Ph.D., Executive Director, at ray-brown@acck.edu.)

Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA). Six universities in six states have formed a collaboration that offers an online master's degree, in which no single institution acts as the central focus. The student enrolls in a participating institution and takes online courses from all six universities, then receives a degree from the institution in which he or she originally enrolled. This interstate endeavor to create joint distance education degrees may offer lessons in international joint efforts (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 16, 2001: A38).

Appendix 12

Study Participants
(with FIPSE Project Numbers)

Projects featured:

- Eckerd College (P116J990035)
- Kettering University (P116J960014 and P116N970015)
- Orange Coast College (P116J980066)
- Oregon Health Sciences (P116N970022)
- Pennsylvania State University (P116J930013 and P116N960024)
- Rice University (P116J930054)
- San Diego State University (P116N950027)
- University of Houston (P116J970074)
- Western Illinois University (P116N970018)

Additional institutions consulted and/or cited:

- Canisius College
- Clemson University
- Front Range Community College
- Georgia State University
- Harold Washington College/San Diego City College
- Kettering University
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
- University of Illinois at Chicago
- University of Massachusetts, Amherst
- University of Rhode Island
- University of West Florida
- University of Wisconsin, Madison
- University of Wisconsin, Whitewater

Advisory Panel

Carol Bobby, Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors
Carol Fimmen, Western Illinois University
Martha Nichols-Pecceu, Eckerd College
Robert Shoenberg, Project Evaluator
Timothy Thompson, University of Pittsburgh
Jack Van de Water, Oregon State University

Individual experts consulted for specialized expertise:

- Kathryn B. Aberle, associate executive director, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), regarding professional accreditation for engineering and technical fields.
- Milton Blood, president, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AASCB), regarding professional accreditation criteria for business schools.
- Carol Bobby, past chair of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, regarding interview protocols and transnational efforts in these fields.
- Poul Bonde, consultant to ECTS in Europe, about the use of ECTS.
- Peggy Blumenthal, vice president, Institute of International Education (IIE), regarding Global E^3 program, Regional Academic Mobility Program (RAMP), and new directions in the field.
- Barbara Burn (deceased), former associate provost for international programs, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Marjorie Peace Lenn, director of the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education, about publications.
- Janet Headley, director of project in teacher education, Georgia State University, about her program that incorporates overseas experience in student teaching.
- Stephen Hunt, manager, International Programs, National Library of Education, U.S. Department of Education, on national information centers, professional accreditation, and recognition across borders.
- Axel Markert, director, International Relations, University of Tuebingen (Germany), on ECTS and European initiatives.
- William Nolting, chair, NAFSA's Study Abroad Section (SECUSSA), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, on study-abroad issues.
- Timothy Thompson, senior admissions officer, University of Pittsburgh, on complete descriptions of European and international initiatives, and on "Other Frameworks" section of this guide.

Appendix 13

Useful Sources and Resources, Print and Electronic

Abroad by Design. Maryelise Lamet, editor. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2000. This publication is a collection of model and sample documents representing college and university best practices in study abroad.

American Council on Education. Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education. Edited by Kenneth Von Alt. Washington, DC: ACE, annual.

——. *Guidelines for College and University Linkages Abroad.* Third edition. Washington, DC: ACE, 1997.

——. *An International Visitor's Guide to U.S. Higher Education.* Washington, DC: ACE, 1999.

——. *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys about International Education.* Washington, DC: ACE, 2001.

The Center for Quality Assurance in International Education (CQA). Quality Assurance of Higher Education and Professional Practice in the Global Context. Washington, DC: CQA, 2001. CD-ROM.

——. *Foundations of Globalization of Higher Education and the Professions.* Washington, DC: CQA, 1999.

——. *Globalization of the Professions and the Quality Imperative: Professional Accreditation, Certification, and Licensure.* Washington, DC: CQA, 1997.

Collins, Naomi F. and Barbara Turlington. *North American Higher Education Mobility: A U.S. Perspective on Quality Assurance and Credit Transfer.* The authors developed this draft paper for a UTEP conference in March 2000, discussing terms and issues in U.S. quality assurance.

Davis, Todd. *Open Doors.* New York: Institute of International Education, annual.

Johnstone, D. Bruce. "In the Absence of a National Ministry: Unifying and Standardizing Forces in United States Higher Education." *Policy Perspective,* June 1993, pp. 17–20. This concise article summarizes major issues.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. *Cooperating with a University in the United States: NAFSA's Guide to Interuniversity Linkages.* Washington, DC: NAFSA, 1997. Similar to ACE's Linkages report, this document is geared toward universities outside the United States.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Select web sites:

American Council on Education (ACE): http://www.acenet.edu.

Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA): http://www.aspa-usa.org. E-mail: aspacd@aol.com.

Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC): http://www.conahec.org and http://www.elnet.org.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA): http://www.chea.org.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE): http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/FIPSE.

Institute of International Education (IIE): http://www.iie.org.
For Open Doors, see http://www.opendoorsweb.org; for Global E³, see http://www.iie.org/pgms/global-e3.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators: http://www.NAFSA.org.

U.S. Department of Education
National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity: http://www.ed.gov/offices/ope/student/fil01.html.
Accreditation and Eligibility Determination Division: http://www.ed.gov/offices/ope/student/file01.html.

U.S. Department of State: http://www.state.gov.
For the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, previously USIA: http://exchanges.state.gov or http://usinfo.state.gov.

U.S. Network for Education Information: http://www.ed.gov/NLE/USNEI.

The University of Massachusetts handbook on study abroad, with section on academic and administrative matters: http://www.umass.edu/ipo/exchange.

The University of Southern California Center for Global Education: http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/globaled.

HE 036 013

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Where Credit Is Due: Approaches to Course and Credit Recognition Across Borders in U.S. Higher Education Institutions	
Author(s):	
Corporate Source: ACE	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☒

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Wendy Brafman	Printed Name/Position/Title: Director of Publications	
Organization/Address: ACE Pubs One Dupont Circle NW 5th floor Washington DC 20036	Telephone: 202-939-9380	FAX: 202-833-4760
	E-Mail Address:	Date: 10/16/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org